



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,253	03/09/2005	Sebastian Hallensleben	P17536-US1	2834
27045	7590	02/02/2010		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER GYORFI, THOMAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2435	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/02/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/527,253	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HALLENSLEBEN, SEBASTIAN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thomas Gyorfi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2435	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 and 7-17 remain for examination. The correspondence filed 10/16/09 amended claims 1 and 11.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has primarily argued that the new limitation regarding the use of the same identifier being used by both networks is not disclosed by the prior art of record.; however, it is important to note that, despite the amendment to the claims, the claims do not limit the instant invention from using a **plurality** of identifiers during the overall authentication process. As long there exists at least one identifier that is shared between networks, then that would be enough to satisfy the claims. Turning to the Anton reference, Examiner believes that Applicant may be referring to the fact that there are at least two identifiers employed by that system: EF1 (created by the mobile device itself: col. 9, lines 35-45) and EF2 (created by the second network: col. 9, lines 45-65). Note that the claims specifically recite that the claimed identifier is used between the first and second networks. EF1 is created by the mobile device itself, but does not appear to have much use beyond communicating it to network 129. Network 129 creates the identifier EF2, and it is this identifier that is sent to the authentication network for identification and authorization of the user desiring mobile access. Also note that once the authentication network verifies that access should be granted, it sends a message back to network 129 which may alternatively include either EF2 again

Art Unit: 2435

or optionally a third newly created identifier (col. 10, lines 15-35); it should be evident that in the former case, both networks are using EF2 to identify the mobile device, even though the mobile device itself would prefer identifying itself as EF1. Examiner thus submits that identifier EF2 satisfies the new claim limitation(s) as currently written.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-4 and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anton et al (U.S. Patent 7,185,360) in view of Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent 6,163,843).

Regarding claims 1 and 7:

Anton discloses a method and system for requesting access for a user to an application in a further network, wherein an entity providing said application can be accessed from at least through a first network and a second network, comprising: granting the user access to the second network (col. 8, lines 45-60; col. 9, lines 20-25); receiving a request for accessing the application from the user (Ibid); detecting that the user already contacted the application via the first network (col. 9, lines 20-45); receiving the requested identifier by the second network (Ibid, and col. 9, lines 45-65); and sending a request by the second network for accessing the application and the identifier received from the first network towards the entity providing the application (Ibid, and col. 10, lines 1-45). Anton further discloses wherein the first network and

Art Unit: 2435

second network use the same identifier amongst themselves to identify the user requesting access to the application (EF2: col. 9, line 46 – col. 10, line 35).

Although Anton discloses the first network generating an identifier to identify the user (col. 10, lines 30-35), Anton does not explicitly disclose wherein requesting by the second network from the first network an identifier that has been used by the first network to identify the user towards the entity that provides the application. However, Inoue discloses an analogous system wherein a mobile device attempting to access a remote node from a foreign network may be authenticated by requesting an identifier from its home network (col. 10, lines 50-60; col. 11, lines 25-40; Figure 6). The claims are thus obvious because all of the elements were known in the prior art, and one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Examiner also wishes to note that, given that the application(s) to be accessed in at least the Anton invention are web applications, it is now accepted as Applicant-admitted prior art that the ability of a second network to detect that user already contacted the application from a first network was already quite well known in the art, and could be achieved through the use of common HTTP cookies (see the enclosed Wikipedia reference, particularly pages 2-3, "Privacy and anonymity").

Art Unit: 2435

Regarding claim 11:

Anton discloses a system for handling a user request towards an external application wherein a network node providing said application is accessible from a first computer network and a second communication network, said second communication network comprising: means for receiving an access request from said user wherein said access request is for accessing said application associated with said network node (col. 8, lines 45-60; col. 9, lines 20-25); means for determining that the user had previously attempted to access said application using said first communication network (col. 9, lines 20-45); and means for requesting access request to said network node from said second communication network using user information including an identifier generated by the first communication network (Ibid, and col. 9, line 45 – col. 10, line 45). Anton further discloses wherein the first network and second network use the same identifier amongst themselves to identify the user requesting access to the application (EF2: col. 9, line 46 – col. 10, line 35).

Anton does not explicitly disclose wherein the second communication network has means to request and subsequently receive said user information from the first communication network. However, Inoue discloses an analogous system wherein a mobile node connected to a foreign network attempting to access a service on a remote network will cause the foreign network to contact the mobile node's home network for user information (col. 10, lines 50-60; col. 11, lines 25-40; Figure 6). The claim is thus obvious because all of the elements were known in the prior art, and one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no

Art Unit: 2435

change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Examiner also wishes to note that, given that the application(s) to be accessed in at least the Anton invention are web applications, it is now accepted as Applicant-admitted prior art that the ability of a second network to detect that user already contacted the application from a first network was already quite well known in the art, and could be achieved through the use of common HTTP cookies (see the enclosed Wikipedia reference, particularly pages 2-3, "Privacy and anonymity").

Regarding claims 2 and 8:

Anton further discloses wherein the first and second network are run by a different operator (col. 11, lines 10-25).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 14:

Inoue further discloses sending authentication information to the first network (Figure 6).

Regarding claims 4 and 10:

Anton further discloses wherein the entity providing the service stores a profile of the user at reception of the first attempt of the user to access the service, wherein the profile is associated with the identification sent from the first network and wherein the

Art Unit: 2435

second network uses the same identification for the user towards the entity providing the service in order to achieve that the stored profile is used for the user (col. 9, line 45 – col. 10, line 35; cf. col. 5, lines 5-20).

Regarding claim 12:

Anton further discloses wherein said user information includes user identification data used by said first communication network in communicating with said network node (col. 10, lines 15-35).

Regarding claim 13:

Anton further discloses wherein said user information includes user preference information used by said first communication network in communicating with said network node (using cookies: col. 5, lines 20-35).

Regarding claim 15:

Anton further discloses receiving an indicator from said user (col. 9, lines 25-45).

Regarding claim 16:

Inoue further discloses means for determining that the user had been ported from said first communication network to said second communication network (col. 8, 27-32).

Regarding claim 17:

Inoue further discloses storing the identifier in the first network (col. 11, 20-45).



***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571)272-3849. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2435

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TAG

1/30/10

/Kimyen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435